

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 12 are pending in this application. Independent Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12 have been amended to reflect the checking of reservation times as illustrated in step S26 of FIG. 7A, for example, without the introduction of any new matter.

The outstanding Office Action includes a repeated erroneous objection to Figure 1, a requirement for a new title, and a repeated rejection of Claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Naughton et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,020,881, Naughton) in view of Venkatraman (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,487) Brown et al, Bambert et al, Schneier, and Rohatgi et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,625,693, Rohatgi).

**RESPONSE TO OBJECTION TO FIGURE 1**

Turning first to the objection to Figure 1 that is again presented based upon the oversimplification that Figure 1 shows what is old in the art, it is again noted that the description of Figure 1 at page 17, line 15, through page 18, line 9, in the specification makes it clear that this figure represents a schematic view "of a constitution of a preferred embodiment of the invention." As noted in the last response, this schematic view of the preferred embodiment includes terminals 1-1 and 1-4 that are shown in more detail in Figures 2 and 3, and not simply just providers 3-1 and 3-2 being connected to the internet 4 as asserted. The enclosed substitute sheet should leave no doubt that the objection is misplaced and should be withdrawn.

Appln. No. 09/059,765  
Reply to Office Action of 10/01/03

The objection to the title indicates that the PTO is not using the previously amended title. In any event, the previously amended title is amended to adopt the suggestion of the outstanding action and this objection should be withdrawn.

#### RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS


The teachings and fair suggestions of Naughton Venkatraman, Brown et al, Bambert et al, Schneier, and Rohatgi do not include, *inter alia*, any hint of an electronic mail indication from the network that no reservation for the requested reservation time has been made when there is an overlap of the requested reservation time with any previously entered reservation times with the remote terminal associated with the external video recording device providing the electronic mail indication of no reservation to the network. As each of the independent Claims include this subject matter in various degrees, withdrawal of the outstanding rejection is believed to be in order. Withdrawal of the outstanding rejection is further in order as the required demonstration of reasonable motivation to support the suggested reference modifications is not present. For instances, programming of the reservation is what comes over the internet and there would be no reason to separate the VCR from the internet as unreasonably alleged at page 4 of the outstanding action.

Application No. 09/059,765  
Reply to Office Action of

As no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, it is believed that the present application is in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle  
Registration No. 40,073

Attorney of Record  
Raymond F. Cardillo, Jr.  
Registration No. 40,440

Customer Number

**22850**

BDL/RFC/jmp  
Tel. no.: (703) 413-3000  
Fax no.: (703) 412-2220